UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/924,055	08/08/2001	Kenji Morita	041465-5115	6163

9629 7590 03/09/2006

MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER	
NATNAEL, PAULOS M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2614	

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/924,055	MORITA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Paulos M. Natnael	2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 December 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-9* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *1,4 and 7* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *2,3,5,6,8,9* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims **2,3,5,6,8, and 9** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Otsuki, U.S. Patent No. 5,847,685.

Considering claim 2, Otsuki discloses a TV monitor 33, a photosensor for detecting rising angle of the monitor 33. The rising angle of the TV monitor 33 can be detected by, for example, attaching a photosensor (sensor member) 55 to the movable bracket 22 as shown in FIGS. 9 or 11, and providing on an inner surface of the corresponding guide member 39 a plurality of striped reflecting members 53, 53, . . . (see FIG. 2) opposing the photosensor 55 when the TV monitor 33 is raised and the movable bracket 22 is moved to the position where the first guide members 30 engage in any of the concave portions 36e to 36g of the click members 36, and applying a signal from the photosensor 55 to a controller (not shown) for determining to which one of the reflecting members 53 the photosensor is facing. Accordingly, by outputting a control signal to stop operation of the motor 49 from the controller based on the input signal from the photosensor 5, the TV monitor 33

can be automatically set to any desired rising angle. Note that when the rising angle of the TV monitor 33 is not automatically set, the rising angle of the TV monitor 33 may be changed by manually rotating the TV monitor 33.

except for;

c) a receiving control device for placing the display device in the inactive state in a receiving device when it is detected that the display of all the video has been completed

Regarding c), Otsuki discloses "a controller (not shown) for determining to which one of the reflecting members 53 the photosensor is facing. Accordingly, by outputting a control signal to stop operation of the motor 49 from the controller based on the input signal from the photosensor 5, the TV monitor 33 can be automatically set to any desired rising angle." (col. 12, lines 47-51) Therefore, it would have been obvious to the skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Otsuki by providing a control signal to control the photosensor 55 for outputting the video image to the display screen only when the monitor 33 is fully raised or extended to its viewing position, so that the viewer would not miss the start of the video image because the display screen is not fully raised to its viewing position.

Considering claim **3**, wherein the active state is a state at which the display device is placed so that the video displayed on the display device is visible, is met by the raised position of the monitor 33, fig. 14;

Considering claim **5**, a display control method comprising the steps of: detecting whether or not display of all video has been completed by display device under an active state; and controllably receiving the display device in a receiving device so as to be placed in an inactive state from the active state, when it is detected that the display of all video has been completed.

Claim **5** is a method claim of claim **2** and as such claim **5** is rejected for the same reasons as in claim **2**.

Considering claim **6**, the display control method of claim 4 or 5, wherein the active state is a state at which the display device is placed so that the video displayed on the display device is visible;

See rejection of claim 3;

Considering claim **8**, a detection device for detecting whether or not display of all video has been completed by a display device to display the video under an active state; and a receiving control device for controllably receiving the display device in a receiving device so as to be placed in an inactive state from the active state, when it is detected that the display of all video has been completed.

Regarding claim 8, see rejection of claim 2.

As for claim **9**, see rejection of claim 3;

3. Claims **2,3,5,6,8** and **9,** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zimmerman U.S. Patent No. 6,816,129 in view of Dabney, U.S. Patent No. 6,633,658.

Considering claim **2**, Zimmerman discloses method and apparatus for adapting a single computer to drive at least two displays. In one embodiment, an apparatus for adapting a single computer to drive at least two displays is disclosed. The apparatus comprises a controller, coupled between a user input device such as a computer, the controller for providing a control signal according to a user input; and a video switcher, for selectively providing a signal from the computer to one of at least two video displays in response to the control signal. In another embodiment, a method of presenting information on at least two displays communicatively coupled to a computer is disclosed. The method comprises the steps of intercepting a user input to the computer, and directing a video output signal from the computer to one of at least two video displays according to the intercepted video input. See abstract. Furthermore, Zimmerman teaches that wherein each of the displays are characterizable by an active state and an inactive state, and wherein the driver provides data from the video switcher to the memory if the display transitions from the active state to the inactive state. See claims 2 and 3,8,10,14,20, and exemplary Fig.4.

Zimmerman does not specifically detect whether or not the display of the video has been completed. However, Zimmerman discloses a microcontroller that controls the overall operation of the system. The microcontroller 206 controls the display panels

and sends the video output after identifying which display is active or not, and sends control signals to put the display panels into active or inactive states as well. It is also well known in the art that a microprocessor or controller may be programmed to control specific operation of the system. In that regard, Dabney et al. ("Dabney") discloses a system and method for managing intermittent interference on imaging systems. Specifically, Dabney teaches on col. 10, line 66 to col. 11, line 14 that the processor 19 (fig.1) using the sync signal detected by sync detector 15 determines when a complete video image frame has been sent by the ultrasound unit 11 to the video display 12 and secondary video monitor 17. Therefore, it would have been obvious to the skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Zimmerman by providing the processor a capability to monitor and determine when the display of video signal is completed.

Considering claims 5 and 8, see rejection of claim 2;

Regarding claims **3,6, and 9,** see the disclosure on fig. 4 that clearly identifies active and inactive state of the display panels.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 12/19/05 in regards to claims 1,4 and 7 are persuasive and the rejection has been withdrawn. Applicant's argument regarding independent claims 2,5, and 8 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that: "the display is retracted when a detection device detects that the display of all the video has been completed." (Remarks, page 10)

Firstly, examiner submits that nowhere do the claims recite, "the display is retracted when a detection device detects that the display of all the video has been completed". In other words, the retracting or expansion of the video display device or whether or not it is being utilized as a vehicle-mounted display system is not claimed in the claims. Nevertheless, Otsuki teaches that using the photo sensor, the rising angle (retraction and expansion) of the monitor 33 can be detected. Furthermore, Otsuki teaches by outputting a control signal to stop operation of the motor 49 by the controller based on the input signal of the sensor 55, "the TV monitor 33 can be automatically set to any desired rising angle."

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paulos M. Natnael whose telephone number is (571) 272-7354. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am - 5:30pmn.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Ometz can be reached on (571)272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Paulos M. Natnael
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2614

March 6, 2006